and e-commerce, we include provisions that force our trading partners to change their laws. When it comes to protection for intellectual property rights, our trade agreements have provisions that force our trading partners to adopt some of the highest levels of IP protection in the world. In each case, if a country violates the rules in the FTA, it is subject to trade sanctions.

Yet, when it comes to respect for the most basic, internationally-recognized worker rights and respect for the environment, our trade agreements say, ''You don't need to change your laws, just enforce whatever you have.'' If our trading partners violate even this weak rule, then they pay a fine; and the fine gets turned around and given right back to them. Somehow, trade sanctions imposed to vindicate the interests of business are just ''tough enforcement,'' but trade sanctions for worker rights or the environment are ''protectionism.''

Worse, our FTAs would allow a country to weaken its laws related to workers' rights and the environment, and the United States would have absolutely no effective recourse. If Bahrain turns around and allows child labor, or turns around and prohibits its guest workers in export industries from joining unions, then the best the U.S. can do is seek consultations with Bahrain. This is a step back from what the Clinton administration negotiated, which would have allowed the U.S. to pursue full dispute settlement on all of the labor provisions in the FTA. It is also a step back from existing U.S. trade preferences programs, which allow the U.S. to impose sanctions on countries that are not adequately protecting basic workers rights.

What is it about worker rights and environmental protection that warrants this disparate treatment? The same people who argue that these provisions do not belong in trade agreements bemoan U.S. labor standards and environmental rules, arguing that they hurt U.S. competitiveness and add to our trade deficit. It is absurd and dishonest to say on the one hand that these rules affect competition, and then on the other that they do not belong in an agreement that is designed to set the terms of competition.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge the good work done by Democrats in the other chamber, who pushed and pushed and got Bahrain to agree to make important reforms to its labor laws to bring them into conformity with internationally-recognized standards. And, to its credit, USTR agreed to monitor Bahrain's implementation and enforcement of these changes as part of the FTA. I applaud the efforts of these congressmen. Their hard work on this and other FTAs should shame anyone who has tried to discredit their cause by calling it protectionist or xenophobic. I regret that I will not be joining them in support of this agreement, however. The bottom line is that this agreement does not contain binding, enforceable rules that treat respect for workers' rights and the environment on the same footing as respect for corporate interests, so I will oppose it.

Separately, I want to address Bahrain's boycott against Israel. For decades now, the United States has had a policy to oppose the Arab League boycott against Israel. There is an entire office in the Department of Commerce tasked with implementing this antiboycott policy. Congress has also directed USTR to ''vigorously oppose'' WTO admission for countries that engage in the boycott. In my view, it is an implicit corollary of this latter rule that the U.S. should not enter into bilateral trade agreements with countries that participate in the boycott.

Bahrain continues to participate in the boycott, however. To its credit, Bahrain has terminated participation in the secondary and tertiary aspects of the boycott. And, Bahrain has stated in a letter to USTR that ''the Kingdom of Bahrain recognizes the need to dismantle the primary boycott of Israel and is beginning efforts to achieve that goal.'' That said, it is worth noting that even the primary boycott can hurt U.S. producers. The primary boycott prohibits imports with Israeli content. So, U.S. companies that use Israeli inputs could be barred from exporting a mostly U.S.-made product to Bahrain.

USTR and supporters of this agreement argue that the quoted statement constitutes a binding commitment by Bahrain to eliminate the primary boycott. I hope they are correct, but I am not so sure. First, the lower house of Bahrain's parliament—the only democratically elected body in Bahrain's national government—recently voted resoundingly to keep the boycott in place. Second, it is not as clear as I would like that the statement at issue has the character of a legal obligation rather than a statement of unilateral intent. While I hope that Bahrain has officially committed itself to eliminating the primary boycott against Israel once and for all, there is certainly no way for the U.S. to bring an enforcement action against Bahrain if it fails to do so.

I think the antiboycott policy we have had in place for decades now is the correct one. We should not be entering into trade agreements—whether bilaterally or through the WTO—with countries that enforce the boycott against Israel—primary, secondary or tertiary. It is disturbing to me that the Bush administration has been quietly moving away from this policy—here in the FTA today, as well as in its support for Saudi Arabia's WTO accession this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4340) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

### NOMINATIONS DISCHARGED

Mr. FRIST. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of the following nominations and that they be placed on the calendar: Michael Copps, PN 1051; Deborah Tate, PN 1052.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AMENDING THE MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND NATIVE AMERICAN PUBLIC POLICY ACT OF 1992

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2093, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2093) to amend the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental and Native American Public Policy Act of 1992 to provide funds for training in tribal leadership, management, and policy, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I have introduced the Native Nations Leadership, Management, and Policy Act of 2005, originally introduced as a component of the Native American Omnibus Act of 2005. I am pleased to be joined by the vice chairman of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, BYRON DORGAN, on this bill.

The Native Nations Leadership, Management, and Policy Act authorizes funding for leadership training, strategic and organizational development, and research and policy analysis to assist American Indian nations to achieve effective self-governance and sustainable economic development. This provision renews authorized funding for the Native Nations Institute programs for a period of 10 years, beginning in fiscal year 2007. Dedicated funding for NNI is necessary to ensure the continuation of these important programs without further draining funds from the Udall Foundation's other educational activities.

Mr. President, I look forward to working with my respective colleagues on both sides of the aisle to enact this legislation.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.